

## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

October 29, 1997

TO:

Members

Joint Committee on Finance

FROM:

Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583: Budget Provisions Affecting the Legislature

In its version of the 1997-99 state budget (Enrolled AB 100), the Legislature included a number of provisions which required state agencies to report to or seek approval of, legislative committees regarding the implementation of certain programs. Of the Governor's 152 partial vetoes, 26 of them affected legislative oversight. Regarding these vetoes, the Governor's veto message of 1997 Act 27 states:

"I vetoed the most burdensome of these new reporting requirements because most state agencies have seen their funding reduced in this budget, on top of the reductions in the last budget. Adding new workload demands at a time when budgets are further constrained interferes with the ability of agencies to provide basic services to citizens. I believe there are far too many legislative directives in the budget since the day to day management of state agencies is the responsibility of the executive branch of government."

#### SUMMARY OF BILL

Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583 would, in essence, override some of the Governor's 1997-99 budget vetoes affecting legislative oversight. Specifically, the bills would entirely reverse four of the vetoes and reverse two portions of another. The budget vetoes affected by SB 335/AB 583 are shown below.

### Veto Item B-2. Agrichemical Cleanup Fund Fees

As passed by the Legislature, Assembly Bill 100 would have required that if DATCP uses the emergency rule process to modify agrichemical surcharge rates, the Department would have been required to receive approval from the Joint Committee on Finance under a 14-day passive review process before the rules are submitted to the Legislative Council.

The Governor's partial veto deletes this provision.

Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583 would restore the language adopted by the Legislature in Enrolled AB 100.

### Veto Item B-27. Required Studies and Approvals

As passed by the Legislature, Assembly Bill 100 would have required DNR to receive the following approvals or submit the following studies to the Legislature or legislative committees:

- a. Wildlife Damage Claims and Abatement Program. Require DNR to submit a proposal in each fiscal year to the Joint Committee on Finance for the level of funding to be allocated under the appropriations related to the wildlife damage program. Prohibit DNR from expending any funding from wildlife damage program appropriations until Joint Finance approves the proposal for the fiscal year. Allow DNR to request that Joint Finance amend any allocation of funding for the wildlife damage program.
- b. Tribal Licensing and Registration Reciprocity. Require DNR to receive the approval of the Joint Committee on Finance before entering into any agreements authorizing or recognizing the sale of tribal hunting or fishing licenses or recreational vehicle registrations to non-tribal members in exchange for fish or game harvest limits.
- c. Campground Reservation System. Require the Joint Committee on Finance to review the contract negotiated by DNR and the vendor chosen for the campground reservation system under the 14-day passive review process before final approval of the contract.
- d. Bike Trail Study. Require DNR to submit a study to the appropriate standing committees of the Legislature by July 1, 1998, on the feasibility of paving state bike trails, including such factors as effects on trail maintenance and usage and the applicability of similar efforts in other states.
- e. Licensing Database Use and Fees. Require DNR to submit a bill draft to the Joint Committee on Finance and the Joint Committee on Informational Policy by January 1, 1998, relating to providing access to records containing personally identifiable information in its database of persons holding hunting and fishing licenses and boat, snowmobile and ATV

registrations. Require the draft to consider state open records policy, privacy concerns and use of access fees to fund DNR's use of information technology.

The Governor's partial veto deletes these five requirements.

Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583 would restore the language of Enrolled AB 100 regarding "b" (tribal reciprocity) and "d" (bike trail study). The provision on tribal reciprocity would only apply to future agreements (now the Lac du Flambeau agreement that is currently in force).

## Veto Item B-34. Evaluation of Proposed Major Highway Projects

As passed by the Legislature, Assembly Bill 100 would have required DOT to promulgate rules that would: (a) establish a procedure for numerically rating proposed major highway projects; and (b) specify a minimum score that a project must receive before DOT could recommend the project to the Transportation Projects Commission.

The Governor's partial veto deletes this provision.

Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583 would restore the language adopted by the Legislature in Enrolled AB 100.

# Veto Item B-35. Appropriation Adjustments for Federal Aid Changes

As passed by the Legislature, Assembly Bill 100 would have required DOT to annually submit a plan to the Joint Committee on Finance on how the Department proposes to allocate federal highway aid amounts after federal highway aid amounts become known and would have prohibited DOT from making any adjustments to federal highway aid appropriations until approved by the Joint Committee on Finance.

The Governor's partial veto deletes this provision.

Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583 would restore the language adopted by the Legislature in Enrolled AB 100.

## **Veto Item C-15. Income Augmentation Funds**

As passed by the Legislature, Assembly Bill 100 authorized DHFS to use federal funds received under Title IV-E (foster care and adoption assistance), XVIII (medicare), and XIX (medical assistance) of the federal Social Security Act as a result of income augmentation activities for which the state has contracted to support costs that are exclusively related to the

operational costs of augmenting federal revenues. This provision would have required DHFS to submit a plan to the DOA Secretary for approval if DHFS proposes to use any Title IV-E, XVIII and XIX revenues received as a result of income augmentation activities for any purpose not specifically related to augmenting federal revenues. If the Secretary of DOA approves the plan, he or she would have been required to submit the plan to the Joint Committee on Finance for approval under a 14-day passive review process.

The Governor's partial veto deletes the requirement that the DOA Secretary submit the plan developed by DHFS to the Joint Committee on Finance for the Committee's approval.

Senate Bill 335/Assembly Bill 583 would restore the language adopted by the Legislature in Enrolled AB 100.

BURKE DECKER GEORGE JAUCH WINEKE SHIBILSKI COWLES PANZER **JENSEN OURADA** 2 HARSDORF ALBERS **PORTER** KAUFERT LINTON COGGS AYE HO ABS 2